1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 3 · - - - - - - - - X UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 18-CR-6094 4 Plaintiff 5 Vs. XAVIER TORRES Rochester, New York May 19, 2022 6 Defendant 10:00 a.m. 7 - - - - - X 8 TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE FRANK P. GERACI, JR. 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 10 U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: ROBERT MARANGOLA, ESO. 11 100 State Street Rochester, New York 14614 Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff 12 13 MAURICE J. VERRILLO ESQ. 14 3300 Monroe Avenue Suite 301 Rochester, New York 14618 15 Appearing on behalf of the Defendant 16 17 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Stephen Ryck 18 19 COURT REPORTER: Brandi A. Wilkins 20 scalisba@gmail.com Kenneth B. Keating Federal Building 21 100 State Street, Room 2120 Rochester, New York 14614 22 23 24 25

THE CLERK: This is 18-CR-6094, USA versus Xavier Torres. Rob Marangola is here for the Government. Maurice Verrillo for Mr. Torres and Jennifer Fish from probation. You may be seated. This matter is on for sentencing.

THE COURT: Are you Xavier Torres?

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This matter is on for sentencing. There are a number of matters the Court needs to address before we get to the sentencing matter. First of all, the defense did request certain mental health records from various correctional facilities.

The Court did take the opportunity to review those records in camera, determined that most of those should not be disclosed to the defendant in that they did not impact the determination in the hearing that we had with the exception of records from Allegheny Correctional Facility. The Court did disclose those two the defense counsel based upon the fact there's some indication regarding memory issues of Mr. Nunez.

Subsequent to that, the Court did receive memorandums from both the defense and the Government related to that hearing. Regarding the mental health records, the Court did not find anything in there that

would cause concern regarding memory issues of the witness. In fact, there were a number of inconsistencies in the records, some reported memory issues, but there was no diagnosis of any short term or long term memory issues that would give the Court reason for pause or concern. Did you want to be heard anymore than that, Mr. Verrillo?

MR. VERRILLO: I do want to be heard on the Government's response to my summation, but I don't know if we're there yet. So I think the Court has submissions on mental health issue.

THE COURT: Okay. The second thing I want to address again just to make clear for the record the defense did make motions under Rule 29, a motion for a judgment of acquittal. The Court denied that at the trial and subsequent in the post verdict motions based upon the fact that the evidence that was presented to the jury was sufficient for the verdict that was returned by the jury and that there are issues of fact for the jury to determine, particularly the credibility of the witnesses who testified in this case, and therefore, I want to reiterate that the motion under Rule 29 for motion for judgment of acquittal is denied.

There's also a motion under Rule 33 for new

trial on a number of grounds including reiteration that the motion denying suppression of certain statements by the defendant should be reexamined by the Court. The Court determined that there was no reason to reexamine that determination and that is a basis for the motion for a new trial was denied as well. In addition, there was a motion for a new trial based upon the defensive argument that the Court errored in charging the jury in particular in providing Pinkerton charge to the jury, and once again, the Court has previously denied that motion and continues to deny that motion.

The third issue is the murder cross reference pursuant to guideline 2D1.1D. The Court did conduct a hearing regarding that particular matter. The Court has received submissions from both the defense and the Government related to that. Did you want to be heard on that, Mr. Verrillo?

MR. VERRILLO: Yes, Judge. I extensively discussed Mr. Nunez. I'm not going to repeat that. I just want to point out that the Government had requested the hearing, sentencing hearing first of all, and next that Mr. Standish has no personal knowledge of what happened on June 6, 2016. I had pointed out during cross examination that he gave

sworn testimony to a Buffalo City Court judge which was inconsistent with his testimony in court including he indicated there his last contact was June 4, 2016. When he testified before the Buffalo City Court Judge that was on June 8, 2016, he did not say he knew of a shooting or he saw any article of a shooting.

Mr. Standish doesn't provide independent corroboration of any of Nunez's claims. Also, even if it was true that there was this meeting or get together where he was shown an article, that doesn't prove anything as far as we're concerned. The testimony of Robert Figueroa and others about the events of the shooting which they were not present at are also inconsistent with Nunez including who drove Flacco to Buffalo. So I just wanted to make those points in addition to what we've already raised in our papers.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Marangola.

MR. MARANGOLA: Judge, the testimony of Mr. Standish with regard to the defendant showing him that article was never impeached. He was not asked about any murder -- or article and when he was asked about the murder he testified about the article that he was shown. He was shown that by the defendant irrelated to the specific murder that Mr. Nunez testified the

defendant orchestrated and he was never impeached about that point. Not only did he show him that article but he made the comment that the person was begging for his life and that he had fucked with the wrong people, excuse my language. I believe that was the comment he had made indicating that he had some knowledge other than just simply having read it in the local news.

And finally, with respect to the fact that he pointed out to that the Government requested the sentencing hearing, Judge, the Government merely sought since he objected to that application the application of the murder reference guideline to round out the record on that particular point. So if he had not objected to it, we wouldn't have asked for a hearing, but he nonetheless objected, felt it appropriate that the court have additional information to make his fact finding on that issue. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. VERRILLO: Judge, one other thing if I could.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. VERRILLO: Mr. Nunez when he testified testified about what he did and there was no mention about Mr. Gonzalez begging for his life. So I just

want to state that. There was no mention of that in his direct testimony. So other people have claimed that, but the witness who says he was there did not testify to that.

THE COURT: Thank you. Regarding the cross reference under guideline 2D1.1, the Court did conduct the hearing at the request of the Government. Victor Nunez did testify that he had entered into a cooperation agreement with the Government. He had pled guilty to conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute heroin. His guideline sentencing range 290 to 365 months.

Mr. Nunez did admit involvement in two homicides, one of Mr. Garcia on January 20 of 2016 which was conducted with Odell Torres, that that actually involved murder of the wrong individual and murder of the brother of the target, and then on June 6 of 2016 did travel to Buffalo, New York, with the defendant Xavier Torres and murdered Jonathan Gonzalez. Both of those murders were directed by Carlos Javier Figueroa.

The testimony from Mr. Nunez indicated that he had been involved in the sale of heroin since a young age, sold drugs on Burbank Street for Carlos Figueroa, and Jonathan Gonzalez, the victim of the

homicide in Buffalo, sold and packaged the drugs as well for Mr. Figueroa. That he was directed to kill Jonathan Gonzalez because he had sold drugs that did not come from the Figueroa organization, that he did receive the guns involved in that homicide from 699 Main Street which was the possession -- one of the locations of the drug trafficking network distribution centers.

Mr. Nunez did admit on the stand that he had some mental health issues, was however never treated for those, that he used heroin and marijuana on a daily basis at some time, that he ODed on heroin at one point in 2015, that he was in a motor vehicle -- motorcycle accident that did not result in any brain injury, that he had no problems with memory. He did indicate some hallucinations at some point. It was unclear whether or not those were related to some type of injury or medications that he was taking, did indicate that he had suffered from issues of depression based upon the -- in particular the charges that were placed against him.

Mr. Nunez did admit quite frankly that he was not truthful to investigators during proffer sessions, that he was not truthful during his testimony before the Grand Jury and at other times.

However, based upon the testimony of Mr. Nunez and in concert with the corroboration of some of the testimony that occurred at trial, the Court finds that Victor Nunez was in fact a credible witness regarding the involvement in the murder of Jonathan Gonzalez and therefore that the cross reference to murder under guideline 2D1.1 will apply as to the defendant Xavier Torres.

The Court is aware of the testimony of Louis Rosario who seemed to conflict with some of the testimony regarding his presence in Buffalo, the use of other matters. The Court does not find any of those that testimony convincing to dispute the testimony of Victor Nunez. In addition, his testimony at the trial from the witness, Standish was a previous Department of Corrections officer testified regarding his involvement in this drug conspiracy as a customer and also the testimony of Roberto Figueroa that corroborated the testimony of Victor Nunez. Therefore the Court finds that there is evidence by preponderance of the evidence to support the cross reference to murder under guideline 2D1.1.

The next issue the Court wants to deal with are the numerous objections that have been raised by the defense. Do you want to be heard on that?

MR. VERRILLO: Judge, I think my papers are sufficient.

THE COURT: Mr. Marangola, anything further on that?

MR. MARANGOLA: No. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. There are a number of objections filed by the defense to the presentence report. First one was an objection to the use of various aliases for which the defendant was known including Pistolita, Peewee, P and Pepe. There was testimony from a number of different witnesses at the trial that did corroborate the use of those particular aliases by Mr. Torres. Peewee apparently was referred to in 2009 presentence prepared by the United States Probation Department.

Xavier Torres was another name used by the defendant that was listed as an alias on one of a previous criminal wrap sheets. P and Pepe were names that were used by the defendant, Mr. Torres. That was articulated by confidential informant information as well. In any event, the use of the aliases and the -- by the defendant in no way impacts the guideline range and therefore that objection is overruled.

The defense did object to Paragraphs 35 and 36 regarding the factual summary in this case, and

again, that was based upon previous reports and testimony that was supported and therefore that objection's also overruled and again that has no impact on the ultimate guideline determination.

The defense objected to Paragraphs 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 54, 58 and 59 which all refer to activities by co-defendants. The defendant was charged and convicted of a conspiracy in this case. Therefore the acts of all the could conspirators were relevant information for the probation department to provide to the Court for its consideration. The co-defendants all had different roles as often occurs in conspiracies and worked together to accomplish the goals of the conspiracy, and therefore, the objection to those paragraphs is also denied.

The defense objects to Paragraphs 46, 47, 55 and 56 claiming that he never used the nickname P.

Again, discovery indicates otherwise, and again, that has no impact on the guideline range so that objection is also overruled. The defense objects to Paragraphs 51, 52 and 53 regarding a red Honda that was involved in this conspiracy. The defendant stated that he walked there, did not utilize this particular vehicle; however, the testimony conflicts with that.

Ultimately, the defendant was arrested and did indicate that he had on him heroin -- or excuse me, a Honda he had on him heroin, the cocaine packaging materials and marijuana, and again, to reference that particular red Honda has no impact on the guideline range and therefore that objection is also overruled.

The defendant objects to Paragraphs 60, 61, 62, 63 and 67 regarding the murders of Luis Garcia Pizarro, Walter Russ, Caesar Lopez. Luis Garcia Pizarro was killed on January 20 of 2016 by Victor Nunez and Obed Torres Garcia. As previously indicated, Mr. Luis Garcia was killed in error. It was supposed to be the brother that was killed in that particular case.

Carmona during the course of this conspiracy, and the testimony indicates that Xavier Torres killed Cesar Antonio Lopez through the testimony of Roberto Figueroa and as previously indicated as well Jonathan Gonzalez. This was all a conspiracy and the homicides during the course of conspiracy in furtherance of the conspiracy are acts that can be considered against all the co-conspirators, and therefore, that objection is also overruled.

The defense objects to Paragraphs 64 and 66

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13

challenging again the murder -- reference to the murder of Jonathan Gonzalez or Flacco. Once again, based upon the testimony of Mr. Nunez, Mr. Gonzalez was shot by him on June 6 of 2016, shot nine times in the head, back, shoulder, buttocks and also appears he was shot in the finger when he attempted to defend himself as well. Mr. Nunez did plead guilty and admitted that particular murder and also testified at the hearing before this Court regarding the murder cross reference pursuant to guideline 2D1.1. Therefore, that objection's also overruled. The defendant objects to Paragraphs 68, 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73 regarding alleged statements made by the defendant, Xavier Torres, to law enforcement; specifically a statement alleged that the defendant made -- that Carlos Javier Figueroa was trying to have him murdered. The defendant does now deny that particular statement; however, there is evidence in the record regarding the underlying criminal complaint and other documents that support that alleged statement of the defendant, Torres, and therefore, that objection is also overruled. The defendant objects to Paragraphs 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98 and 99.

those references by the probation department in its summary to the Court is information that is derived from trial testimony oftenly quoted direct testimony from the particular witness. The jury did examine all this testimony, ultimately found the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Therefore, the objection to those paragraphs 74 through and including 99 is also denied.

Defendant objects to Paragraphs 104, 105 and 106 which is simply a summary of the information provided to the Court. Based upon the prior rulings, that objection is also overruled. The defendant objects to the guidelines Paragraphs 112, 117, 120, 144 and 145 objects specifically to the determination that the base offense level's 43. Based upon the applicability of guideline 2 D 1.1D1 that indicates if a victim is killed under circumstances constituting murder that that should be considered.

As I stated a number of times now on June 6 of 2016, Flacco or Jonathan Gonzalez was killed by Victor Nunez, shot nine times at the direction of the major player of this conspiracy Carlos Javier Figueroa. That homicide was committed during and in furtherance of the conspiracy. There's clearly proof by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant

and Nunez lured Jonathan Gonzalez to Buffalo with the 1 2 intent to kill him, and therefore, the appropriate 3 base level pursuant to 2A1.1A is Level 43 and that is 4 the appropriate guideline base level. The objection 5 is also overruled. Anything further on the 6 objections? 7 MR. VERRILLO: Judge, I did include with my summary testimony from Axel Camacho on the Gargolo 8 9 shooting which she referred to Dommy being involved in the shooting. So I just wanted to note that I did 10 11 attach that to my original statement of sentencing 12 objections. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Yes. I'll read note of 14 it and it's part of the record. Anything further, Mr. 15 Marangola? Thank you, Your Honor. 16 MR. MARANGOLA: No. 17 THE COURT: Okay. With those rulings, I believe we're ready to proceed. The Government have a 18 19 statement to make? 20 MR. MARANGOLA: Yes. Thank you, Judge. Your Honor, I'll be brief. The Court sat through two 21 22 trials in which a tremendous amount of detail was put forth describing this organization. The defendant, 23 24 Xavier Torres, he was a participant in this large 25

scale cocaine and heroin trafficking operation. They

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

16

used fear, intimidation, guns and violence to succeed. They did that to sell a lot of drugs, and this defendant's role was one of those violent enforcers that allow and enable these drug trafficking organizations to succeed. And his violence went to the highest level and included murder. This defendant is a former Latin King member. He's been to federal prison already for heroin trafficking and he returned to that same activity. I would ask that the sentence that the Court imposes gives justice to the people in that Burbank Street area who were victims and held hostage in that community while these men poisoned this community. It gives justice to the victims who ingested that poison themselves and finally to John Gonzalez and his family for the defendant's involvement in orchestrating and perpetuating murder in general and specifically the murder of John Gonzalez on June 6, 2016. Unless the Court has any questions for me, I thank you. THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Marangola. Verrillo? MR. VERRILLO: Judge, Mr. Torres, Xavier

Torres is 37 years old. He has three children and he

also has one grandchild. We had submitted some letters from the daughter, the niece and the sister which talk about their relationship and what he has represented to them, the significance of that.

His history included being raised by his mother primarily with limited contact with his father. He primarily resided in Buffalo. He did live in the area for a period of time. We would submit he return to Buffalo in November of 2015. He has a history of drug usage which he would obviously benefit from some substance abuse counseling.

The issue of sentencing as the Court knows is up to its discretion, has full power, has the guidelines are advisory. I did want to cite the cross reference of US versus Cordoba-Murgas 233 F.3D 704 Second Circuit 2000 when you have a case where there's a substantial increase obviously from the guidelines. It was just a drug issue to this enhancement. I think it's a nine point -- nine level difference and I'd ask the Court to consider the significance of that.

It's our position, continues to be that there were substantial doubts as to the Government's case related to the Gonzalez matter because of the issues we've raised about Nunez, but the Court has discretion regardless as to how it will sentence, and

the history that Mr. Torres has as I understand it the criminal convictions did not involve any prior claims of shooting or prior violent crimes.

A life sentence is very harsh and I know the Court has the power to do that. It's a very harsh sentence, and Mr. Torres during this whole proceeding has been respectful of the Court and has not been a problem in the Court. I want the Court to note that. The minimum sentences that are available are significant.

I'd ask the Court to consider that for both counts and I'd ask the Court to recommend substance abuse programs for Mr. Torres. I'd also ask that he be placed as close to Lancaster, Pennsylvania as possible. His sister is here in the courtroom today and she would like to have continued contact with him. So those are our requests of the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. Mr. Torres, would you like to say anything?

MR. TORRES: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Nothing? In this matter, the defendant, Xavier Torres, was convicted after a jury trial of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine and the second count of possession, brandishing and discharging firearms in furtherance of

a drug trafficking crime. He's been in custody approximately 37 months and 10 days. He's 37 years of age, has no high school degree or GED, is a United States citizen. This involves a conspiracy that was conducted between 2015 and January 29 of 2018, a conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine along with other substances and also the use, possession, brandishing and discharging firearms in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime.

The defendant was previously convicted in this very court May 13, 2009 of a conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute heroin. Carlos Javier Figueroa was the leader of a violent, large sale, sophisticated drug conspiracy. He ran a drug trafficking organization in the City of Rochester in multiple locations. It involved the distribution of multiple kilos of cocaine and other substances that arrived from Puerto Rico to the Rochester area.

The investigation involved wire taps, surveillances and cameras in various locations, search warrants, and the use of confidential informants.

That information indicated that the organization operated multiple locations throughout the City of Rochester to package and distribute controlled substances particularly from the Clinton Burbank area

in the City of Rochester.

The defendant Xavier Torres as part of that organization to play a key role in that organization. He was arrested initially on February 6 of 2016 in the area of Clinton and Burbank Street where heroin, cocaine and marijuana were discovered. The defendant did run from that particular location when confronted with law enforcement and was ultimately secured. Heroin and cocaine were found on his person as well.

There were multiple controlled lies related directly to this defendant specifically June 12, 2015, July 21, 2015, July 30, 2015 in the area of Burbank Street that involved both heroin and cocaine. As referred to earlier, Victor Nunez did testify that he was involved in a homicide in January of 2016 with Obed Torres Garcia where they killed Luis Garcia in error when they were supposed to kill his brother. There was testimony that March 31, 2016 Xavier Torres killed Caesar Lopez. Mr. Lopez was shot some 11 times.

In the testimony to the hearing, Mr. Nunez indicated that on June 6 of 2016, Mr. Nunez and Mr. Torres did lure Jonathan Gonzalez, Flacco, another individual involved in conspiracy to Buffalo, New York with the intent to kill him, did lure him to that

location to an alley way in the City of Buffalo and shot him some nine times.

Another homicide during the course of conspiracy was September 12, 2016 which the defendant Cruz Carmona Garcia killed Walter Ross at the corner of Clinton and Burbank Street again at the direction of Carlos Javier Figueroa based upon the fact that Mr. Ross was selling controlled substances in an area that Carlos Garcia -- or Carlos Figueroa considered to be his territory. Testimony is that the defendant did upon arrest give a statement to the law enforcement admitting that this organization was distributing approximately a kilo of heroin on a weekly basis.

There's also extensive testimony during the trial of Mr. Xavier Torres regarding his involvement in this organization. Although it appears he was gone for some period of time, all the acts that were just referred to were all in furtherance of the conspiracy and during the course of the conspiracy, and therefore, the defendant is responsible for those acts of the could conspirators.

This case involved a number of co-conspirators including Carlos Javier Figueroa who was recently sentenced to two life terms plus 25 years consecutive, Laysha Ponce de Leon who was a mistress

of Carlos Figueroa sentenced to 168 months imprisonment, Roberto Figueroa who testified in the trial of Carlos Figueroa and is yet to be sentenced, Jonathan Cruz Carmona who did murder Walter Ross sentenced to 300 months imprisonment, John Carlos Pizarro was sentenced to 168 months imprisonment, Obed Torres Garcia was sentenced to 255 months imprisonment, Victor Nunez has yet to be sentenced along with Orlando Yelder.

Jose Justamino Rodriguez was sentenced to one year and one day. Joshua Figueroa to a probation sentence, Freddy Silva to 57 months and Felix Figueroa to 96 months. A number of people involved and the magnitude of those sentences speaks volumes about the sophistication and the extent of this drug trafficking organization.

Regarding the first count, the conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine, the Court finds that the base offense level should be 43 based upon the guideline 2D1.1, and based upon if a victim was killed under circumstances that constitute murder during in furtherance of conspiracy that that is the proper guideline range. Based upon the finding of the Court that the defendant was involved in the homicide of Jonathan Gonzalez, that is the appropriate base

level for this charge. There was no reduction for accepting responsibility.

The defendant has made it clear that he accepts no responsibility for any of the acts involved in this conspiracy. His sentencing statement indicates he maintains he's innocent and challenges the facts alleged and denies involvement in any of the homicides, denies even that he made a statement to law enforcement, although the statement made to law enforcement appears to be in his interest in that he made a statement to law enforcement believing that Carlos Javier Figueroa intended to have him murdered as well. He disputes the calculation of the base offense level of the Court as well.

The defendant's criminal history category is a level three. He has a 2001 youthful offender adjudication of controlled substance 7th degree, disorderly conduct in 2002, 2002 conviction for criminal possession of a firearm in the third degree, again a youthful offender adjudication. The defendant was sentenced to probation and violated the conditions of probation. 2004 disorderly conduct, 2006 unauthorized use of a motor vehicle, 2007 attempted criminal possession of a controlled substance in the 7th degree, 2009 conviction before this Court, the

Western District of New York and Buffalo for conspiracy to possess and intent to distribute heroin. 2010 escape charge for failure to attend a treatment program. 2015 criminal possession of a controlled substance 7th degree. 2016 criminal possession controlled substance 7th degree and 2017 attempted criminal possession of a controlled substance in the 7th degree.

The defendant is 37 years of age, was born in Puerto Rico. His father had a criminal history as well. His mother is on social security disability. It appears his father was an alcoholic and did physically assault his children including at one point breaking the arm of the defendant's sister, threw a TV at her at one point. The defendant's unmarried, has three children 20, 10 and 8, is in good physical health.

Any mental health issues are related to depression and stress primarily based upon the charges that have been placed against him. The defendant's consumed alcohol since the age of 14, marijuana since the age of 14, cocaine since the age of 15, heroin at the age of 34. He attended the 9th grade at Grover Cleveland High School, dropped out for the streets and did work at some point for a candy company.

Mr. Torres, the Court has to consider a number of factors determining the appropriate sentence here including the seriousness of the offense. As I just went through this articulates of the facts in this case and the testimony the Court heard this was a very sophisticated and violent long term organization. It was callus in its concern for human life. You were a key component of that conspiracy. You were involved in those homicides.

Your involvement could only be characterized as violent, brutal and callous. You had a chance to turn things around back in 2009, some 13 years ago now, when you were sentenced in this court, but instead you decided to maintain your involvement in a sophisticated drug conspiracy. That was your decision. I don't know what you thought the end game here was, but as you can see, the end game usually involves death. Members of the conspiracy being killed as you believe that Carlos Javier Figueroa at one point may have intended to have you murdered and then you got involved in the homicide of other individuals.

You showed absolutely no responsibility for any of your actions involving drug trafficking or the violent acts that you carried out. You showed no

remorse for your actions whatsoever. You apparently learned nothing from your prior convictions.

Based upon all of that, the Court has considered the seriousness of the offense and your background and character, your involvement in a number of criminal activities, your alleged involvement with the Latin Kings in the Buffalo area with this drug conspiracy with a number of homicides. The Court has to impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of those offenses and promotes respect for the law and deters you and others from engaging in this type of activity in the future.

I agree with Mr. Verrillo, a life sentence is a very tough sentence; however, you've earned that sentence by your actions, by your callousness, by your total inability to accept any responsibility for your actions. You are much too dangerous to live on the streets of this community. Therefore, the Court finds on the first count of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute cocaine that the defendant, Xavier Torres, be sentenced to life imprisonment. On count two, the charge of possessing, brandishing and discharging firearms in furtherance of drug trafficking crime, the Court finds that a sentence of 20 years consecutive to the life term is appropriate.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

Again, the discharge of firearms in this case involved a number of homicides as well, and therefore, that is an appropriate sentence. In the intent of the Court in imposing such a significant sentencing consecutive to the life sentence is with the intent that you never be released from prison. That's to be followed by a period of ten years of supervised release on count one and five years concurrent on count two with a number of conditions that if you are released that you not violate any federal, state or local laws, that you prohibit from possessing firearm, ammunition or dangerous device, shall not possess a controlled substance unless prescribed by a physician, must submit to drug testing based upon the history here of use of controlled substances illegally.

You must cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample, must participate in a program for substance abuse including substance abuse testing such as urinalysis and other testing, undergo a drug and alcohol evaluation and treatment. If substance abuse is indicated by the testing, probation will supervisor the details of the testing and treatment including the selection of the treatment, provider and the schedule.

If inpatient is recommended, it must be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

approved by the Court unless the defendant consents. He's not to leave treatment until completion or as ordered by the Court. While in treatment and after discharge from treatment he is to abstain from the use of alcohol and must contribute to the cost of services rendered. Shall submit to a search of his person, property, vehicle and residence upon reasonable suspicion and permit confiscation of any evidence or contraband discovered. Shall notify probation of any opiate based pain medication prescribed before the prescription is filled, shall provide probation with access to any request of personal or business financial information. Probation is authorized to release presentence and post sentence financial information submitted by the defendant to the United States Attorney's Office for the collection of any unpaid financial obligations including fines, assessments for restitution. I don't believe there's any request for restitution; is that correct. MR. MARANGOLA: Correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. The Court does impose a fine of \$2,500 on count one. Any interest on the fine is waived. While incarcerated, if the defendant is

non UNICOR or UNICOR grade five, shall pay

installments of \$25 per quarter. If it's not agreed

to one through four in UNICOR, shall pay installments of 50% of his monthly pay as an inmate. While on supervision, shall make monthly payments at the rate of 10% of his monthly gross income. The defendant shall pay a special assessment of \$100 on each of the counts, one and two, for a total of \$200 shall be due immediately and can be made to the Bureau of Prisons financial responsibility program.

The Court will recommend the defendant serve in a facility close to Lancaster, Pennsylvania should he have the availability of his family and also that if there's any drug treatment programs available while he's in custody to be able to participate in those programs. Anything further from probation?

MS. FISH: Judge, just to clarify, does the Court wish to order the statutory language under 18USC3664N.

THE COURT: Yes. That is specifically if
the defendant -- well, there's no restitution. There
is a fine. Based upon the fact the defendant is
obligated to pay a fine, if he receives resources from
any source including inheritances, settlement,
insurance, lawsuits or other judgments during a period
of incarceration shall be required to apply the value
of such resources to any outstanding restitution or

In addition, the defendant shall forfeit his 1 2 interest in one Ruger pistol, serial number 33213800. 3 Anything further from probation? 4 MS. FISH: No, Judge. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Are there any counts to be 6 dismissed, Mr. Marangola? 7 MR. MARANGOLA: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Anything further from the 8 9 government? 10 MR. MARANGOLA: No, thank you. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Verrillo? 12 MR. VERRILLO: No, Judge. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Torres, I do notify you of 14 your right to appeal in this case, and your attorney 15 has filed numerous motions, proceedings and objections to the sentencing. All of those obviously preserve 16 17 your right to any of those issues upon appeal as I notify you of that and to stay in contact with your 18 19 attorney regarding a finding or a notice of appeal if 20 that is your request. Thank you. 21 MR. MARANGOLA: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 (Proceeding concluded at 10:59 a.m.) 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER I certify that this is a true and accurate record of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York before the Honorable Frank P. Geraci Jr., on May 19, 2022. S/ Brandi A. Wilkins Brandi A. Wilkins Official Court Reporter